

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:

*All Indirect Purchaser Actions;*

Master File No. 3:07-CV-05944-JST  
MDL No. 1917

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
INDIRECT-PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE  
CERTAIN DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL  
[D.E. 5439] PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL  
RULES 7-11 AND 79-5(d)**

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

2 After full consideration of the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Seal  
3 Documents and the Declaration of Rachel S. Brass in Support of Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs'  
4 Administrative Motion to Seal Documents, the Court orders as follows:

5 The motion to seal Alioto Declaration Exhibits 23, 30, and 34 are GRANTED. These  
6 documents are "privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the  
7 law." Civil L.R. 79-5(b). In the case of these documents, compelling reasons exist to rebut the  
8 strong presumption of access to judicial records (see *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809  
9 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016), because disclosure of this information would provide CPT's  
10 competitors with a competitive advantage by disclosing customer relationships and internal  
11 processes that would allow CPT's competitors to adopt methods that made CPT successful in the  
12 CRT industry, and which it continues to use in its other display-focused businesses today, and thus  
13 allow those competitors to more easily allow them to compete in the professional display  
14 manufacturing marketplace. *In re Hewlett-Packard Co. S'holder Derivative Litig.*, No. 12-CV-6003,  
15 2015 WL 8570883, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2015), report and recommendation adopted, 2015 WL  
16 8479543 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2015), *aff'd*, 716 F. App'x 603 (9th Cir. 2017) (compelling reasons  
17 existed to seal internal corporate policies and procedures in part because of the harm the sealing  
18 party would suffer "if competitors had access to this sensitive corporate playbook"); *Barnes v.*  
19 *Hershey Co.*, 2015 WL 1814293, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2015) (compelling reasons existed to seal  
20 internal documents containing "client management strategies" because "disclosure of these emails  
21 would put Hershey at a competitive disadvantage").

22 Further, Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs are ORDERED to file Alioto Exhibits 19, 28, 32, and 33  
23 on the public docket.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25  
26 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 HONORABLE JON S. TIGAR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE